UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,050	03/24/2004	Scott E. Dart	MSFT122098	5784

26389   7590   11/26/2007
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER
ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/809,050	DART ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen Alvesteffer	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 September 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 11-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 11-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed June 12, 2007, found to be non-compliant and re-submitted with corrections September 7, 2007. Claims 1-9, 11-16, and 19-23 are amended. Claim 10 is cancelled. Claims 1, 13, and 23 are independent. Claims 1-9 and 11-23 remain pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: "wherein **the the** at least one graphical element" should read —wherein **the** at least one graphical element—. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amadio et al. (hereinafter Amadio), United States Patent Application Publication number 2002/0075312, and Sullivan et al. (hereinafter Sullivan), United States Patent number 6,651,216.

Regarding claim 1, Amadio teaches a method for reducing the amount of space

occupied by a plurality of graphical elements including at least one graphical element

having a filename when the plurality of graphical elements is rendered on a graphical

user interface (see Amadio Figure 2 and paragraph [0006]; "*Thumbnails, list, and icon*

views, for example, provide very minimal information about the item making it difficult for

the user to identify the item and its properties. Details view, on the other hand, displays

numerous properties for the item, typically more information than is required, resulting in

wasted space in the view. In addition, details view displays the same properties for each

item regardless of the item type. For instance, in details view, the same properties

would be displayed for a text file as a music file. Showing the author of the file may be

pertinent for a text file but not for a music file. As a result, unimportant information is

displayed", it is a goal of Amadio to reduce wasted space in the view by only displaying

pertinent information about a file), comprising: determining for each graphical element of

the plurality of graphical elements if a filename is or is not to be displayed with the

graphical element when the graphical element is rendered, the determination being

based on the type of object that the graphical element represents (see Amadio

paragraph [0035]; "*with the present invention the relevant properties that are displayed*

in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That is, depending on the item type, different

properties will be displayed in slot 508", the filename is a property that might be

determined to be irrelevant to the display of image files); for each graphical element of

the plurality of graphical elements whose filename is displayed with the graphical

element when the graphical element is rendered, rendering the graphical element and

the filename on the graphical user interface (see Amadio paragraph [0035]; "*with the*

present invention the relevant properties that are displayed in slot 508 are specific to

that item type. That is, depending on the item type, different properties will be displayed

in slot 508", files in which the filename is determined to be a relevant property will have

the filename displayed); and for each graphical element of the plurality of graphical

elements whose filename is not to be displayed with the graphical element when the

graphical element is rendered, rendering the graphical element, but not the filename, on

the graphical user interface (see Amadio paragraph [0035]; "*with the present invention*

the relevant properties that are displayed in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That

is, depending on the item type, different properties will be displayed in slot 508", files in

which the filename is determined to be an irrelevant property will not have the filename

displayed). Amadio does not explicitly teach for each graphical element of the plurality

of graphical elements whose filename is not to be displayed with the graphical element

when the graphical element is rendered, adjusting the alignment of the plurality of

graphical elements on the graphical user interface to reduce the amount of space

occupied by the plurality of graphical elements. Sullivan teaches adjusting the graphical

elements on the graphical user interface to reduce the amount of space occupied by the

graphical elements when rows are hidden (see Sullivan column 8 lines 1-5; "*changing*

the values of this table's Visible and Row fields will cause header rows to become

visible or hidden and will shift the visible ones up or down on the screen"). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to shift the rows of file icons upward when information is hidden as taught by Sullivan in

the invention of Amadio for the purpose of reducing wasted space in the graphical user

interface.

Regarding claim 2, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that the at least one graphical

element is an icon (see Amadio Figure 2).

Regarding claim 3, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that determining if a filename is or

is not to be displayed with a graphical element on the graphical user interface is based

upon a type of data associated with a component of the filename (see Amadio

paragraph [0035]; *"with the present invention the relevant properties that are displayed*

in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That is, depending on the item type, different

properties will be displayed in slot 508", the filename is a property that might be

determined to be irrelevant to the display of image files).

Regarding claim 4, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that the filename is not to be

displayed if the data associated with the component of the filename is image data (see

Amadio paragraph [0035]; *"with the present invention the relevant properties that are*

displayed in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That is, depending on the item type,

different properties will be displayed in slot 508", the filename is a property that might be

determined to be irrelevant to the display of image data).

Regarding claim 5, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that the filename is not to be

displayed if the data associated with the component of the filename is multimedia data

(see Amadio paragraph [0035]; *"with the present invention the relevant properties that*

are displayed in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That is, depending on the item

type, different properties will be displayed in slot 508", the filename is a property that

might be determined to be irrelevant to the display of multimedia data).

Regarding claim 6, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that determining if the filename is

or is not to be displayed on the graphical user interface is based upon an attribute of the

filename (see Amadio paragraph [0035]; "*with the present invention the relevant*

properties that are displayed in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That is, depending

on the item type, different properties will be displayed in slot 508", the filename is often

used to determine the file type).

Regarding claim 7, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that the filename is not to be

displayed if the filename is determined to be a machine generated file name (see

Amadio paragraph [0035]; "*with the present invention the relevant properties that are*

displayed in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That is, depending on the item type,

different properties will be displayed in slot 508", the file type is capable of being

machine generated).

Regarding claim 8, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that the filename is not to be

displayed if the filename has a filename extension related to multimedia files (see

Amadio paragraph [0035]; "*with the present invention the relevant properties that are*

displayed in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That is, depending on the item type,

different properties will be displayed in slot 508", the filename is often used to determine

the file type, which can be multimedia or non-multimedia).

Regarding claim 9, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that the filename is not to be

displayed if the filename extension relates to one of image, video and audio (see

Amadio paragraph [0035]; "*with the present invention the relevant properties that are displayed in slot 508 are specific to that item type. That is, depending on the item type, different properties will be displayed in slot 508*", the filename is a property that might be determined to be irrelevant to the display of image, video, and audio file types).

Regarding claim 11, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that when the plurality of graphical elements whose filenames are not to be displayed are rendered, adjusting at least a row of the plurality of graphical elements whose filenames are not to be displayed so that the graphical elements are proximately closer to one another as compared to a positioning of the graphical elements whose filenames are to be displayed (see Sullivan column 8 lines 1-5; "*changing the values of this table's Visible and Row fields will cause header rows to become visible or hidden and will shift the visible ones up or down on the screen*", shifting the rows upward make the rows of graphical elements proximately closer to one another).

Regarding claim 12, Amadio/Sullivan teaches shifting a row of graphical elements whose filenames are to be displayed vertically upward, the shifting of the row being possible as a result of the filenames being absent from the graphical elements whose file names are not to be displayed (see Sullivan column 8 lines 1-5; "*changing the values of this table's Visible and Row fields will cause header rows to become visible or hidden and will shift the visible ones up or down on the screen*").

Claim 13 recites a system with substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 1. Amadio further teaches that the invention can be practiced on a system comprising a processing unit, memory, and a display, as recited in the claims of the

instant application (see Amadio paragraph [0021]; "*The invention is operational with numerous other general purpose or special purpose computing system environments including, personal computers, server computers, hand-held or laptop devices, multiprocessor systems, microprocessor-based systems, set top boxes, programmable consumer electronics, network PCs, minicomputers, mainframe computers, distributed computing environments that include any of the above systems or devices, and the like*"). Therefore, claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 14, Amadio/Sullivan teaches that the system is one of a computer, a personal digital assistant, a mobile device and an information device (see Amadio paragraph [0021]; "*The invention is operational with numerous other general purpose or special purpose computing system environments including, personal computers, server computers, hand-held or laptop devices, multiprocessor systems, microprocessor-based systems, set top boxes, programmable consumer electronics, network PCs, minicomputers, mainframe computers, distributed computing environments that include any of the above systems or devices, and the like*").

Claims 15-21 recite a system with substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 7, 11, and 12, respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22 recites an article of manufacture with substantially the same limitations as claim 1. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 23 recites a method with substantially the same limitations as claim 12. Therefore, claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

The Drawings submitted June 12, 2007 are accepted by the examiner. Accordingly, all objections to the Drawings are withdrawn.

Claim 12 has been amended to correct a minor informality. Accordingly, the objection of claim 12 is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 11-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Amadio teaches a display of icons representing files that shows only relevant information depending on the file type represented. Sullivan teaches shifting graphical elements upward when certain information is hidden from view.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Alvesteffer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571)272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stephen Alvesteffer
Examiner
Art Unit 2173

11-21-2007

TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER